



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

doms clashed and changed, nursed the sacred fire and meditated on the Law of the Lord."

In the present state of knowledge, with literary sources mainly at second-hand and scrappy, while over most of the territory in question where the monumental sources lie buried the archæologist has not yet broken ground, no definitive history can be written; but Mr. Bevan has done good work in this fore-study of what must ultimately take its place as a notable chapter in the great history of Hellenism. Should the book ever come to a second edition, which is hardly probable, it would be the better for two or three "helps": first, a chronological table like that prefixed to Mahaffy's *Greek Life and Thought*; second, side-notes such as make Grote's *History* and many subsequent works doubly useful and usable; and third, some such digest and critique of authorities as Holm appends to his chapters. The three maps are fair and the plates excellent, presenting a fine series of Seleucid portrait-heads on forty-six coin types.

J. IRVING MANATT.

*Augustus: The Life and Times of the Founder of the Roman Empire.*

By E. S. SHUCKBURGH. (London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1903. Pp. x, 318.)

*Augustus Cæsar and the Organisation of the Empire of Rome.* By JOHN B. FIRTH. [Heroes of the Nations.] (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1903. Pp. xvi, 371.)

"AUGUSTUS," says Shuckburgh, "has been much less attractive to biographers than Julius; perhaps because the soldier is more interesting than the statesman; perhaps because the note of genius conspicuous in the Uncle was wanting in the Nephew." Firth, after remarking that to his knowledge no biography of Augustus had yet appeared in English, suggests that "the reason of this apparent neglect may be found in the circumstance that his character is one of the most puzzling in antiquity. The Emperor Julian compared him to a chameleon; Augustus himself signed his State papers with a ring bearing the device of a Sphinx. Both the man and his work remain 'a contradiction still'; theory and practice in his case persistently refuse to be reconciled; one can hardly feel quite sure at any given point in Augustus's life that one knows exactly what he had in mind." Perhaps a still better reason is that the biographer finds extremely little to add to the historian. Firth and Shuckburgh enter a field which has already been well cultivated; historians like Merivale, Schiller, Herzog, and Duruy, whose works include the reign of Augustus, have dealt creditably with the subject, and each in his own way has solved, or attempted to solve, the sphinx-riddle. In approaching these two recent biographies, therefore, we may look for little that is new; but we shall not be disappointed in expecting to find the old material put into a fresher and more convenient form.

The compass of the two works is nearly the same, Shuckburgh treating the subject with somewhat greater detail. After devoting a few pages

to the childhood and youth of Augustus, both writers proceed to narrate his public career — in other words, to write the history of Rome during his lifetime. This treatment includes the condition of Rome and the Empire at the death of Julius Cæsar, the political struggles and the civil wars from 43 to 31 B. C., the organization of the imperial government, the provinces, the chief events of the reign of Augustus, his patronage of literature and religion, his family affairs, and his character. As little is known of his motives and feelings, the treatment must be to a great extent impersonal. Lacking therefore the essential feature of biography, a life of Augustus can hardly be more than a chapter from Roman history. For this condition of their subject, however, Firth and Shuckburgh are in no way responsible.

Characteristic of the present trend of opinion is the attitude of these two authors toward the revolution from Republic to Empire. Shuckburgh and Firth are in thorough sympathy with Julius Cæsar and his work ; they have no love for the oligarchs, whose mismanagement made the revolution necessary. Though Cicero naturally suffers along with the oligarchs, he is a far better and abler man than he appears to be in Mommsen's history ; he is "the great man" (Shuckburgh), "the patriot statesman — and with all his faults no Roman better deserved that honourable name" (Firth). Young Octavius falls heir to the sympathy for Julius felt by the biographers. They fully appreciate his ability and especially his inborn talent for intrigue ; and they follow with admiration his early career, without attempting to make black white, or to deny or excuse his cruelty in the proscriptions of 43 B. C.

One of the most interesting and most extensively discussed subjects connected with Augustus is the character of his government. Whereas earlier writers had uniformly described the government of Augustus as "a monarchy disguised in republican forms," Mommsen declared it to have been a dyarchy — a division of authority between the Senate and the prince —, and his view is now accepted by most scholars, who apply it with more or less consistency to the treatment of the early Empire. But Shuckburgh, after mentioning this view, insists that Augustus was really "a monarch, whose will was only limited by those forces of circumstance and sentiment to which the most autocratic of sovereigns have at times been forced to bow." Firth, following the present trend of thought, says of Augustus :

His great aim was to graft the Principate upon the Republic. He did not wish to uproot the old tree and plant a new one ; his desire was to furnish the old tree with a new branch, which should be the most vital of all its limbs. In the constitution were many magistracies ; he added yet another. If it was one of extraordinary scope and power, the justification was that the times required it.

Though the magisterial powers of the prince were vast, the government was not for that reason a monarchy pure and simple. It was still a republic in the theory expressed by Augustus and accepted by the Senate ; but in fact the term dyarchy aptly applies to it because of (1)

the division of the Roman world into Italy and the Empire, each with peculiar administrative principles and machinery ; (2) the division of the Empire into senatorial provinces and imperial provinces ; (3) the two treasuries ; (4) the two sets of officials. But Firth supposes that the dyarchy fell at the accession of Tiberius, if not before, whereas writers generally continue it to Domitian or even to Aurelian. For the right understanding of this subject it is advantageous to separate the arbitrary acts of the emperors from the legitimate working of the constitution. This discrimination is necessary, especially as the period of the early Empire was one in which usurpation and tyranny were easy.

The final chapter of each book is devoted to the great enigma — the character and aims of Augustus. Firth minutely analyzes the first emperor's character ; Shuckburgh, avoiding detail, finds space for a brief estimate of the intimate friends of Augustus. Firth, more ready than Shuckburgh to accept the gossip of Suetonius, discovers in the emperor a combination of loose morality and asceticism. Both authors, while bearing in mind the hypocrisy of his position, rightly appreciate the substantial nature of his achievements. Firth says in conclusion :

He knitted together the Roman world, east and west, into one great organisation of which the emperor stood as the supreme head. He set his legions upon the distant frontiers and their swords formed a wall of steel, within which commerce and peace might flourish. . . . Augustus started the Roman world on a new career. He made it realise its unity for the first time. That was his life-work, and its consequences remain to this day.

On the whole, Shuckburgh treats the subject more objectively, and is perhaps a little more careful in his statement of facts, though Firth's book will doubtless prove more interesting to the general reader. Both writers, however, are attractive as well as scholarly, and their works will certainly be helpful to all who are interested in Augustus and his age.

GEORGE WILLIS BOTSFORD.

*An Introduction to the History of Western Europe.* By JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON, Professor of History in Columbia University. (Boston : Ginn and Company. 1903. Pp. x, 714.)

IN the opinion of the writer this is the best manual of general European history which has yet appeared in English. And the reason for Professor Robinson's comparative success in the impossible task of compressing into seven hundred readable pages a clear account of the chief events and movements of European history from the barbarian invasions of the fifth century to the formation of the kingdom of Italy and the German Empire appears to be the consistent application to his task of two principles — omission and emphasis. Mr. Robinson has proved the sincerity of the opinion expressed in his preface, that most elementary manuals of history mention too many men and too many facts, and has avoided producing a book which by expecting the student to learn too much runs the danger of teaching him nothing. The author's omissions